

reflectance of the second liquid crystal display element," as originally recited in claims 6, 10 and 13, respectively. However, the Office Action asserts that this feature is disclosed in Mabuchi at Fig. 4. In particular, the Advisory Action asserts that Mabuchi's lights L1 and L2 are each reflectances, and they match with each other because they are parallel with each other and are both forwarded to a display panel 22. This assertion is inaccurate.

As is known, "reflectance" is a ratio between reflected and incidental intensities/fluxes. A light beam, by itself, is not a reflectance. Thus, Mabuchi's lights L1 and L2, individually, cannot be "reflectance."

Furthermore, "reflectance" is a scaler, and is not a vector. Thus, "reflectance" does not carry any notation regarding direction. Therefore, whether Mabuchi's lights L1 and L2 are parallel and forwarded to a display panel only relates to directional characteristics of the lights, and is irrelevant to a scaler "reflectance." Therefore, Mabuchi's lights L₁ and L₂ do not disclose or suggest "reflectance."

The Advisory Action also asserts that "the reflectance of the object" is not recited in the claims. This assertion is baseless. In particular, the term "reflectance" is clearly recited in independent claims 1, 5 and 9, as quoted above.

The Advisory Action further asserts that the term "match" is not clearly defined in the claims. This assertion is without merit. As is known, a match between two scalars indicates that the numeral amount of the two scalars are substantially the same. One of ordinary skill understands what "match" means.

For at least the above reasons, the assertions in the Advisory Action against the claims are inaccurate, baseless, or without merit. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 5, 7, 9, 11, 12 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1, 5, 7, 9, 11, 12 and 14 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Gang Luo
Registration No. 50,559

JAO:GXL/brp

Attachment:
Petition for Extension of Time

Date: June 8, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
